IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

(Special Original Jurisdiction)

SATURDAY, THE TWENTIETH DAY OF AUGUST
TWO THOUSAND AND FIVE

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE C.V.RAMULU

WRIT PETITION No. 9736 of 1999

Between:

K.Ramanjaneyulu

..... PETITIONER

AND

The A.P.State Electricity Board,

Rep.by its Member Secretary,
Vidyut Soudha, Somajiguda,
Hyderabad and another

.....RESPONDENTS

ORDER:

This writ petition is filed questioning the impugned order dated 05.11.1998 passed by the 2nd respondent, wherein the case of the petitioner was rejected while considering his claim as per B.P.Ms.No.36, dated 18.05.1997, on the ground that the petitioner was not on rolls as on 18.05.1997 which is a must in terms of B.P.Ms.No.271, dated 31.12.1997 and also failed in written test.

The petitioner categorically asserted that he worked under the licensed contractor and eligible for appointment as permanent junior lineman. Even not only as on 18.05.1997 but also as on the date of interview, he was on the rolls of the licensed contractor. Therefore, he is entitled for being considered for appointment against 50% of existing vacancies in accordance with B.P.Ms.No.36, dated 18.05.1997.

No counter is filed by the respondents. However, the learned counsel for the respondents contended that once the petitioner is not on rolls and no evidence is produced, there was no option for the respondents except to reject his case.

Be that as it may, without expressing any opinion on merits, I am of the view that if the petitioner is really on the rolls as on 18.05.1997 and as on the date of interview, he is directed to produce documentary evidence to this effect before the respondents and the respondents shall re-consider the case of the petitioner in accordance with law and pass appropriate orders.

Accordingly, the Writ Petition is disposed of. No order as to costs.

_____

C.V.RAMULU,J

Dated: 20.08.2005

Dsr